



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION¹ (*Continued*)

Nowadays it is well-nigh impossible to satisfy the canons of historical composition without a strict adherence to what is known as Historical Methods, or Methodology. "We shall have better history teaching," says Professor Fling, "when we have better trained teachers; and we shall have the trained teachers when the teachers themselves, and those who employ them, realize that history can be taught only by those who have been prepared for the work."² Freeman has also pointed out that in his time things had not been going well in the teaching of history, because too many higher educational institutions, and especially the colleges of England, imagined that any intelligent person can teach history without special training.³ No one can be a successful professor of any science, unless he has gone through the laboratorial processes of scientific analysis and has learned the resultant methods of the science itself. Historical Method is, therefore, the laboratory where the student learns how to study history and how it may best be imparted either in the class-room or by means of writing. Bernheim's classic work on Methodology⁴ not only crystallises all that has been written on the subject up to his time, but remains the point of departure for all subsequent studies on the Historical Method. His volume marks an epoch in the science of studying history. In 1897, appeared the more popular manual of Langlois-Seignobos, *Introduction aux Etudes Historiques*, (3d Edition, Paris,

¹ For the first part of this INTRODUCTORY NOTE, which explains the scope of the Bibliography and divisions to be followed in its construction, see CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. I, No. 1 (April, 1915), pp. 113-119.

² F. N. FLING, *Outline of Historical Method*, p. 5. Lincoln, 1899.

³ E. A. FREEMAN, *The Office of the Historical Professor*, p. 27 ss. London, 1884.

⁴ ERNEST BERNHEIM, *Lehrbuch der Historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie. Mit Nachweis der wichtigsten Quellen und Hilfsmittel zum Studium der Geschichte*. 6th Edition. Leipzig, 1908. Up to the year 1889, when Bernheim first published this monumental work, the principal treatises written on Historical Method were the following: JEAN BODIN, *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem* (Paris, 1566); GERHARD VOSS, *Ars historica* (Leyden, 1623); JEAN MABILLON, *De re diplomatica libri VI* (Paris, 1681); VICO, *Principi della scienza nuova* (Milan, 1725); J. G. DROYSEN, *Grundriss der Historik* (Jena, 1858), translated by E. A. ANDREWS, *Outline of the Principles of History* (Boston, 1893); E. A. FREEMAN, *Methods of Historical Study* (London, 1886); and G. S. HALL, *Methods of teaching History* (Boston, 1883). The most important contribution to this subject is the epoch-making volume by the Bollandist, CHARLES DE SMEDT, S. J., *Principes de la Critique Historique* (Liege-Paris, 1883); Cf. G. MONOD, *Du Progres des sciences historiques depuis le XVIIe siècle*, article, in the *Revue Historique*, vol. I (1876), p. 8 ss.

1905), which has been translated by G. G. Berry, *Introduction to the Study of History*, (London, 1898), and which has accomplished a revival of the Historic Method in France. Bernheim begins his volume with an exhaustive study on the meaning and definition of History, and its relation to other intellectual sciences such as Philology, Politics, Sociology, Philosophy, Anthropology, Ethnology, the Natural Sciences and Art. He then divides the work up into parts: 1) *Methodology*, or the fundamental principles and procedure of arriving at certitude in the study of history;⁵ 2) *Heuristic* or *Quellenkunde*, or the knowledge of the bibliographical sciences, the sources, and the auxiliary sciences of history; 3) *Historical Criticism*, or the question of the genuineness of the Sources, their provenance and value, and the critical arrangement of the facts taken from the sources; 4) *Interpretation* of the sources, the placing of the facts thus established in their physical and social environment, or the philosophy of history; 5) *Methods of presentation*, or the artistic form of the historical narrative. The mention of a profound work such as this in the very beginning of our investigation into the question of a constructive *Bibliographica Americana Catholica*, may at once arouse the suspicion that we are planning it only for specialists and that the history of the Catholic Church in the United States can easily be written without this academic fore-knowledge. We submit that it is necessary; for, otherwise, the work which is being done to-day must be all done over again in the future, because so far in many cases unskilled laborers have been employed. Even outside our own circles, it is being recognized boldly that "work is being turned out at the expense of the State which adds almost nothing to our knowledge and is of such poor quality that it increases rather than lightens the historian's labor."⁶ As Professor York Powell says in his Preface to Berry's translation to Langlois-Seignobos: "Whether we like it or not, history has got to be scientifically studied, and it is not a question of style but of accuracy, of fulness of observation, and correctness of reasoning, that is before the student." History has come to be less a department of literature, less an ammunition source for controversialists, and more the serious study and the sincere and faithful utilisation and interpretation of documents for ascertaining a correct knowledge of the past. The first lesson the Historical Method teaches us is, that without authentic sources no real history can be written; and the second lesson it teaches is, where to find and how to use historical material. Where known sources have been destroyed or where known sources, to which access is denied, cannot be used, the present method of historical science will not allow the student to manufacture facts or to draw inferences. At the outset, therefore, by means of that department in Methodology, known as the bibliographical sciences, the student will

⁵ "Wissenschaftliche Methode ist das Verfahren, aus dem Stoffe einer Wissenschaft die derselben eigenthümlichen Erkenntnisresultate zu gewinnen." BERNHEIM, *o. c.*, p. 179.

⁶ C. W. ALVORD, *The Relation of the State to Historical Work*, in the *Minnesota History Bulletin* (Vol. I, No. 1, 1915, p. 8, of St. Paul, Minn.).

learn what sources are known on this subject, what their nature is, and where they may be found. The next scientific operation which is required in the study of the documentary materials, is helped and guided by what German scholars call: *Hilfswissenschaften*, and by the French, *Sciences auxiliaires*. These *Auxiliary Sciences*, or satellites of history, as Professor Freeman calls them, "are studies whose results are most precious to the historian, but which, in themselves, apart from their use to the historian, seem not to rise above that kind of curious interest which may be called forth by any inquiry to which a man gives his mind."⁷ When the student, therefore, has succeeded in gathering his material either in the original or in copies—photographed, printed, or copied by hand, he will find himself at loss how to proceed unless he call to his help one or more of the Auxiliary Sciences. "It may be," says Fling,⁸ "a manuscript that he has before him, and it may be incumbent upon him to determine its genuineness before using it. The performance of such a task would call for a knowledge of *paleography*, or the science of writing, of *diplomatics*, or the science of documents, and perhaps several others. If it is known that the document is genuine, the student must at least have a knowledge of the language in which it is written in order to interpret it. For some periods, such a knowledge is not easy to acquire. The investigator in the fields of Grecian, Roman, or Mediæval History must have a knowledge of *philology*, or the science of language. He must be acquainted with all the changes that take place in the meaning of a word in order to understand how it is used at a particular time. When the student comes to criticise his sources, and to determine their value, he finds that a knowledge of *psychology* is necessary; in arranging his facts, he must make use of *chronology*; in combining them, of *logic*; in forming the background, he is aided by *geography*, *ethnology*, *economics* and *sociology*; and in searching for the deeper meanings of historical development, by *philosophy*. These are the most important of the auxiliary sciences. There are, of course, many others, determined by the peculiar nature of the subject investigated."

To find one's way through this maze, methods are imperatively necessary; and if we define Methodology as the science which explains the principles and the basic elements of procedure in the use of the Auxiliary Sciences, Bibliography, and Historical Criticism, then two questions present themselves for immediate answer:

1. *How far is the Historical method necessary for the ecclesiastical historian?*

That question might best be answered by presenting to the student such works as:

a) JEAN MOELLER, *Traité des Etudes historiques*, published by his son, Professor Charles Moeller, Louvain, 1897 (pp. 638). This work consists of two parts:

⁷ FREEMAN, *Methods of Historical Study*, p. 49. London, 1886.

⁸ FLING, *o. c.*, p. 23-24.

- A. Methods of studying history.
 - I. General Part: Conferences on the Principles of Historical Criticism, on the Auxiliary Sciences, etc.
 - II. Special Part: Conferences on the Sources and Literature for Ancient, Medieval and Modern History.
 - B. Methods of teaching history.
 - I. General Part: The Principles of Pedagogical methods.
 - II. Special Part: The Application of the methods to the different kinds of history to be taught.
- b) CHARLES DE SMEDT, S. J., *Introductio Generalis ad Historiam ecclesiasticam critice tractandam*. Louvain, 1876 (pp. 533). This work consists of four tracts:
- A. On the principal rules for the art of criticism. This part considers the science of criteriology in its application to ecclesiastical history, and describes the value and the use of documentary materials, the value of oral tradition, of inscriptions, etc., etc.
 - B. On the divisions of ecclesiastical history.
 - C. On the sources of ecclesiastical history.
 - I. Documents in general.
 - II. Hagiographical documents.
 - III. Sources on the history of the Roman Pontiffs.
 - IV. Sources for the history of national and particular churches.
 - V. Sources for monastic history.
 - VI. Monumental sources.
 - D. On the helps to the study of ecclesiastical history.

It will doubtless be granted by many that the ecclesiastical history of the United States cannot be separated, at least up to 1789, from European history. De Smedt's volume will be, therefore, indispensable to the American student. A smaller and more popular manual of Methodology is

c) LEOPOLD FONCK, S. J., *Wissenschaftliches Arbeiten*, published at Innsbruck, 1908, and translated already into French, Italian and Spanish. Father Fonck takes us into the very heart of the Historical Seminar, the laboratory of the student, and speaks to us in the kindly tone of one who has forged out all the hard places for himself and who recognizes the young beginner's difficulties with a broad sympathy and a wise discretion. The most valuable part of the book to the American student is the chapter on *Methods of Publication*.

2. The second question to be answered is: *How far is a knowledge of the Historical Method, and especially of the Auxiliary Sciences, necessary for students of American Church History?* At the outset it may be admitted that such a knowledge need not be so extensive nor so profound as that demanded of the European student, the history of whose country begins many centuries before the discovery of America. But the skilled historian must use all branches of knowledge in such a way that he remains, as Mommsen, master of them all. Not only does he need a complete grasp on the

science of history in order to arrive himself at the truth but even more so in order to judge correctly the unscrupulous and anti-Catholic historians who have already raised up a strong barrier of error and dishonesty against the truth of Catholic doctrines as seen in its vital reality in the history of the Church.⁹ From the wide field of knowledge in general, historians have chosen a certain number of special sciences which, though distinct in themselves from history and from one another, are the student's tools in the workshop of history. These sciences are usually given in the following order: Philology, Chronology, Geography and Topography, Paleography, Diplomatics, Sphragistics or Sigillography, Heraldry, Numismatics, Archæology, Biography and Genealogy, Ethnology and Bibliography. Each one of these special sciences has been greatly developed within the past twenty-five years,¹⁰ and each one of them has its own special value, as an auxiliary science in the complete, all-round study of American Catholic history.

(*To be continued.*)

⁹ Cf. *How Church History is Written*, article in the *Amer. Cath. Quarterly Review*, by Monsignor James A. Corcoran, D. D., Vol. VIII (1883), p. 282-296.

¹⁰ A comparison between Monsignor Kirsch's article *History* in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (Vol. VII, p. 365-380) with similar articles in older publications will show the rapid growth of Ecclesiastical History Methods.